United Nations A/HRC/WG.6/31/MCO/3

General Assembly

Distr.: General
24 August 2018
English
Original: English/French

Human Rights Council
Working Group on the Universal Periodic Review
Thirty-first session
5–16 November 2018

Summary of Stakeholders' submissions on Monaco*

Report of the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights

I. Background

1. The present report was prepared pursuant to Human Rights Council resolutions 5/1 and 16/21, taking into consideration the periodicity of the universal periodic review. It is a summary of 5 stakeholders' submissions[1] to the universal periodic review, presented in a summarized manner owing to word-limit constraints.

II. Information provided by stakeholders

A. Scope of international obligations[2] and cooperation with international human rights mechanisms and bodies[3]

2. Regarding recommendations received in previous cycles,[4] the Office of the High Commissioner for the protection of rights, liberties and for mediation of Monaco expressed regret that the Monegasque authorities had not, for the time being, deemed it appropriate to move towards ratifying the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture and underlined that ratification would make it possible to assess detention conditions on a more regular basis, both within the Prison and in other places of deprivation of liberty, in advance of any complaints.[5]

3. Also concerning recommendations received in previous cycles,[6] the Office of the High Commissioner for the protection of rights, liberties and for mediation noted with satisfaction the recent ratification of the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women (the Istanbul Convention).[7]

4. The European Commission against Racism and Intolerance (CoE-ECRI) noted that Monaco had still neither signed nor ratified Protocol No. 12 to the European Convention on Human Rights, which provided for a general prohibition of discrimination. It noted that the authorities feared that accession would jeopardise Monaco's social covenant, which provided for preferential treatment for its nationals, particularly in respect of employment

* The present document was not edited before being sent to United Nations translation services.

GE.18-13956 (E) 280818 300818
1813956

Please recycle

and housing.[8] CoE-ECRI recalled that certain distinctions based on nationality were made in the law of most Council of Europe member States and that furthermore, the contracting States were allowed a certain margin of appreciation in assessing whether and to what extent differences justify different treatment. Considering Monaco's particular situation and especially the fact that Monegasque nationals were a minority of residents, the aforementioned interpretation of the Protocol enabled certain prerogatives of Monegasques to be justified.[9] It reiterated its recommendation that Monaco ratify Protocol No. 12 to the European Convention on Human Rights.[10]

5. The International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons (ICAN) noted with appreciation that Monaco participated in the negotiation of the United Nations Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear weapons, but regretted that it was absent from the vote and had previously voted against the General Assembly resolution in 2016 that established the mandate for the nations to negotiate the treaty. ICAN recommended that Monaco sign and ratify the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.[11]

B. National human rights framework[12]

6. The Group of States against Corruption (CoE-GRECO) noted that Monaco was a constitutional monarchy where executive power devolved from the Prince. Government was exercised under the authority of the Prince by a Minister of State assisted by a Council of Government. The functioning of the National Council were regulated by the Constitution of 1962, Act. No. 771 of 1964 which was largely updated and amended in 2015, and its Rules of Procedure. Legislative power was shared between the Prince and the National Council. The members of the National Council did not have the power to initiate laws, however; their "proposals" must first be submitted to the Government (which also had the right to initiate draft laws) and the Government decided whether to submit the proposal as a bill of law or to discard it.[13]

7. CoE-GRECO indicated that the general transparency of the National Council's work remained an issue in spite of some recent reforms. It noted, inter alia, that consultations were a matter of practice and that there was no provision in law for any procedure which would make it possible, in all transparency to involve associations in the work or allow citizens to give their opinion without it being necessary for them to be formally invited to do so by a committee or the Council.[14] It recommended that significant measures be taken to enhance the transparency of the legislative process, including with regard to easy public access to adequate information on consultations held, and with regard to reasonable deadlines for submitting draft texts, amendments and working documents.[15]

8. The CoE-Commissioner for Human Rights welcomed the establishment in 2013 of the Office of the High Commissioner for the protection of rights, liberties and for mediation, which played a key role in the protection of human rights in the Principality. However, he considered that the High Commissioner's terms of reference could be extended, in particular by granting it the authority to initiate investigations of its own motion. The power to initiate investigations ex officio could first be applied to fighting discrimination, which is the core of the High Commissioner's terms of reference, as well as to issues relating to the rights of children.[16] CoE-ECRI made similar observations and also noted that the Office could be abolished by a simple sovereign order.[17]

9. The Office of the High Commissioner for the protection of rights, liberties and for mediation indicated that matters could be brought before it by anyone, regardless of their nationality or residence status. Its primary goal of protecting the rights and freedoms of citizens in their dealings with the State administration, together with the specific complementary mission entrusted to it in the area of anti-discrimination, meant that its role at the national level was that of a general human rights institution.[18]

10. The Office noted, however, that the institution did not satisfy all the criteria laid down in the Paris Principles, in particular because of the lack of collegiality in its functioning and the fact that it had been established by means of a regulatory text rather than by law, which had, for the time being, caused it not to request accreditation from the Global Alliance of National Human Rights Institutions (GANHRI).[19] Nevertheless, the

Office emphasized that the conditions for its establishment were in accordance with the specificities of the Monegasque political system, which operated within the framework of a constitutional monarchy that was democratic, but not parliamentary. Thus, like other independent rule-of-law bodies in Monaco, the Office reported on its activities directly to the Sovereign Prince, in an annual report published on the institution's website.[20]

11. The Office was also competent to receive requests from certain authorities to give an opinion or carry out a study on any issue falling within its purview. The Office noted with regret, however, that its opinions and studies could be made public only by the authority that had requested them. The Office highlighted that, from a statutory standpoint, it enjoyed functional independence that reflected its institutional position, as well as guarantees laid down in its founding instrument, in terms of both the conditions of appointment of the High Commissioner and his or her operating conditions. Lastly, it was also stressed that, at the end of the Office's first four-year term in March 2018, a review of its functioning had been conducted, and that amendments to the text of the Ordinance were currently being considered so as to further enhance the effectiveness of the mechanism implemented since the creation of the Office.[21]

C. Implementation of international human rights obligations, taking into account applicable international humanitarian law

1. Cross-cutting issues

Equality and non-discrimination[22]

12. Regarding recommendations received in previous cycles,[23] the Office of the High Commissioner for the protection of rights, liberties and for mediation noted the persistently low number of cases brought before the institution in relation to the fight against discrimination. Although the reasons for that were manifold, the main one was undoubtedly the lack of provisions in domestic law defining and specifically prohibiting discrimination and discriminatory harassment, which made it difficult for the various public and private stakeholders even to understand those issues and for likely victims to be identified as such. While the Office had welcomed the significant progress achieved with the adoption of Act No. 1.410 of 2 December 2014, which had, for the first time, prohibited the differential treatment of persons with disabilities, it had had occasion to recall the need for legislators eventually to extend that prohibition to other grounds of discrimination.[24] The Office expressed the view that it should be possible to give thought to the enactment of an anti-discrimination text that was in keeping with existing priority regimes, as provided for and guaranteed by the Constitution, without calling them into question.[25]

13. The CoE-Commissioner for Human Rights expressed his belief that Monaco should strengthen legislation on protection against discrimination by passing a framework law on protection against all forms of this phenomenon. A law of this kind would make it possible to punish more effectively all instances of discrimination and, in addition, would constitute a strong signal for promoting equal opportunities for all.[26]

14. CoE-ECRI indicated that Monaco's Criminal Code did not expressly criminalise a number of crimes and misdemeanours to combat racism and racial discrimination including: genocide, its denial, public expression of an ideology claiming the superiority of a grouping of persons, and leadership or participation in the activities of a group which promotes racism. Similarly, the Criminal Code did not always stipulate that racist motives constituted aggravating circumstances for ordinary law offences. Monegasque law did not clearly define and did not expressly prohibit direct and indirect discrimination and lacked certain key components of effective legislation against discrimination such as the sharing of the burden of proof.[27]

15. CoE-ECRI recommended that the law explicitly make racist motivation an aggravating circumstance for all ordinary offences.[28] The High Commissioner for the Protection of Rights and Freedoms and Mediation made similar observations.[29]

16. CoE-ECRI also recommended that Monaco: adopt complete legislation on equal treatment and non-discrimination in the fields of private and administrative law;[30] assign to the High Commissioner for the Protection of Rights and Freedoms and for Mediation the function of providing victims of discrimination with legal aid, including representation in the event of court proceedings;[31] and publish their statistics relating to the number of racist, xenophobic, homophobic and transphobic offences reported to the police, the number of prosecutions, the reasons for non-prosecution and the outcome of prosecutions.[32]

17. Concerning gender equality, the Office of the High Commissioner for the protection of rights, liberties and for mediation underlined that the Monegasque legal order still contained some obsolete provisions, particularly in the field of social legislation, that should be either withdrawn or amended.[33]

18. The CoE-Commissioner for Human Rights noted with satisfaction that a bill had recently been passed by the National Council to enable non-married partners, including those of the same sex, to obtain legal recognition and protection of their union. He strongly encouraged the authorities to translate this project into action without delay.[34]

2. Civil and political rights

Right to life, liberty and security of person[35]

19. The Office of the High Commissioner for the protection of rights, liberties and for mediation indicated that, if Monaco were to ratify the Optional Protocol to the Convention against Torture, it would seem appropriate to incorporate, in the Criminal Code, a definition of torture in line with article 1 of the Convention.[36]

20. The Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence (CoE-GREVIO) noted that the definition of domestic violence laid down in Law No. 1.382, described the relationship between the perpetrator and the victim as "spouse of the perpetrator or any other person who lives or has lived with him under the same roof on a long-term basis". CoE-GREVIO indicated that this definition introduced a condition which could exclude certain situations, such as couples who do not live together or "romances" among teenagers and young adults and that the exact scope of this condition depended on how it was applied by the courts and how the latter interpreted the requirement of living under the same roof "on a long-term basis". It strongly encouraged the authorities to adopt a definition of domestic violence in accordance with the definition given in the Istanbul Convention.[37]

21. CoE-ECRI noted that in order to enable homosexual couples to benefit from the new provisions on the prevention of domestic violence, the concept of "persons who live or have lived together under the same roof as the victim" was introduced to the Criminal Code following a long debate.[38]

Administration of justice, including impunity, and the rule of law[39]

22. CoE-GRECO noted that responsibility for ensuring the independence of the judiciary should, in principle, fall to the Judicial Service Commission. Compared to the executive, however, the Judicial Service Commission had only a minor role. Its existence was not guaranteed by the Constitution as it was established merely by legislation. Responsibility for chairing it automatically fell to the executive.[40] CoE-GRECO recommended that the authorities enhance the role and operational independence of the Judicial Service Commission, review its composition and give it a central role in guaranteeing the independence and good functioning of the justice system, as well as in the recruitment, career management and disciplinary proceedings in respect of judges and prosecutors.[41]

23. CoE-GRECO stated that given that Supreme Court judges did not serve full-time, conflict-of-interest rules were especially important, yet no such rules existed for members of the Court.[42] There was also a gap in the law as regards incompatibilities. CoE-GRECO recommended that: the appointment of members of the Supreme Court be based on a transparent procedure and adequate objective criteria; and that they be provided with

appropriate rules on incompatibilities, conflicts of interest and other obligations related to integrity.[43]

24. CoE-GRECO noted the practice of seconding judges and prosecutors to Monaco from a neighbouring country was based on a bilateral agreement between the neighbouring country and Monaco and developed in response to a demand for staff in the Monegasque judiciary. [44] Taking note of information received regarding appointment process, it considered that the situation granted too much discretion to the executive and that more transparent and objective procedures based on public calls for candidatures would be a major improvement.[45] It also noted that judges and prosecutors other than those assigned to the Supreme Court, in particular members of the Court of Review, had continued to engage in gainful and other activities in a neighbouring country, while serving as judges in Monaco.[46]

25. CoE-GRECO recommended that the authorities: ensure the transparency of the process for appointing judges and prosecutors in Monaco, whether seconded or not, based on clear and objective criteria;[47] carry out an assessment of the parallel activities performed by judges and prosecutors, including those who are still working in an neighbouring, and, depending on the results, take the necessary steps to ensure more robust and consistent rules on incompatibilities.[48]

26. CoE-GRECO indicated that Monaco had 38 judges, just under half of them women. It noted, however that women were still very much in the minority in the two highest courts (the Supreme Court and the Court of Review).[49]

Fundamental freedoms and the right to participate in public and political life[50]

27. Regarding recommendations received in previous cycles,[51] the Office of the High Commissioner for the protection of rights, liberties and for mediation stated that, in view of the long-term consequences of expulsion measures and the potentially disproportionate impact that such measures could have on the private and family lives of individuals who had always resided in Monaco and had all their connections there, it was desirable to establish a legal regime to protect "native children" (*enfants du pays*) from refoulement and expulsion, by restricting the removal of individuals who had been born and had always lived in Monaco to certain specific cases where there were imperative grounds for doing so.[52]

28. Concerning banishment, which could also be imposed on Monegasque citizens, the Office observed that, although the punishment had not been inflicted in practice for many years, it had still not been removed from the Criminal Code.[53]

29. CoE-ECRI noted that according to Article 4.4 of Ordinance-Law No. 399 of 6 October 1944 authorising the setting up of trade unions, the majority of members of a trade union bureau must be of Monegasque or French nationality. CoE-ECRI welcomed the fact that consideration was being given to reforming this law. It considered that this part of Article 4 should, in particular, be repealed in the private sector, where 98% of employees are of foreign nationality. CoE-ECRI stated that Monaco should repeal the provisions whereby a majority of the members of the organs of trade unions and their federations need to be Monegasque and French nationals.[54]

30. OSCE-ODIHR indicated that Parliamentary elections took place in Monaco on 11 February 2018 and that noting stakeholder confidence in the overall integrity of the electoral process it had recommended that no election observation activity be undertaken.[55]

Right to privacy and family life

31. Regarding a recommendation received in the first cycle,[56] and on the specific subject of video surveillance, the Office of the High Commissioner for the protection of rights, liberties and for mediation had welcomed the fact that Act No. 1.430 of 13 July 2016 on various measures relating to the preservation of national security had made it possible to fill the legal vacuum that had existed with regard to the introduction of a highly advanced remote street monitoring system in the Principality, bearing in mind the implications for respect for the right to privacy.[57]

32. The Office observed that the modalities for the implementation of article 5 of Act No. 1.430 had been further defined in a ministerial order, which, in particular, had specified the length of time for which data could be stored and had limited access to personal information to officials specifically designated and empowered to handle them by the Police Department, thereby implementing fully the recommendations issued in 2009 by the CoE-Commissioner for Human Rights.[58]

33. The CoE-Commissioner for Human Rights noted the passing of the law on the preservation of national security, which strengthened the means of action of the security services, authorizing, for example, surveillance of individuals without the need for a prior court order where there was a threat to national security. He encouraged the Monegasque authorities to make every effort to ensure that the committee set up to monitor the decisions of the executive in the surveillance field had the appropriate resources to fulfil its role and could act completely independently.[59]

34. CoE-ECRI noted that Order No. 1 447 of 28 December 1956 gave priority to men over women in determining who was to be considered head of household and thus obtained for those entitled through him or her certain social benefits. That rule, which also affected a significant number of foreign women, was condemned in legislative proposal 213, of April 2014, as discriminatory on grounds of gender. In order to bring that discrimination to an end, the drafters of the bill relied on the principle of equal treatment provided in the Constitution and proposed that Monegasque women be similarly allowed to claim head of household status. They considered that this minimum proposal could be extended to enfants du pays, and possibly to residents. CoE-ECRI urged the authorities to bring all discrimination of this kind to an end and recommended that Monaco increase the protection of foreign women against direct and indirect discrimination and provide for foreign women to be able to be heads of household in the same way as their male counterparts.[60]

3. Economic, social and cultural rights

Right to work and to just and favourable conditions of work[61]

35. CoE-ECRI noted information it had received that some foreign workers suffered from uncertain working conditions, such as in the cleaning, security and construction sectors. In the two first-named sectors, it was alleged to be common practice to conclude part-time contracts for extremely short working hours, although in practice the employees worked virtually full-time because they worked overtime. By altering the overtime, the employer could thus exert pressure on the employee. In the construction sector, some foreign employees were said to have been replaced after trying to organise themselves in order to claim their rights.[62]

36. CoE-ECRI also noted that according to information it had received t foreign women suffered twofold discrimination. It noted t allegations of the existence of a practice of dismissing female foreign employees shortly after their maternity leave, on the basis of law No. 729 of 16 March 1963, under which dismissal without reason was possible. CoE-ECRI stated that the responsible departments, particularly the Labour Inspectorate and, if a complaint was lodged, the High Commissioner, should investigate these allegations. Were these to prove accurate, the authorities should take measures to protect those employees and to combat the direct and indirect discrimination to which they were subjected.[63]

37. Regarding recommendations received in previous cycles,[64] the Office of the High Commissioner for the protection of rights, liberties and for mediation welcomed the entry into force of Act No. 1.457 of 12 December 2017 on workplace harassment and violence. The Office expressed regret, however, that the legislator had not deemed it necessary to include a specific definition of sexual harassment, as distinct from psychological harassment, in accordance with article 40 of the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence. It noted that existing legislation explicitly addressed only sexual blackmail, which did not cover all forms of sexual harassment.[65]

Right to an adequate standard of living[66]

38. In the field of housing, CoE- ECRI was pleased to note measures adopted intended to facilitate access to housing such as opening up certain kinds of housing units protected by the State for enfants du pays who included: foreigners who were close relatives of a Monegasque, persons resident in Monaco since their birth, on condition that one of their parents was also resident in Monaco at that time, and persons continuously resident in Monaco for at least 40 years.[67] However, in view of the continuing pressure on the real estate market, it considered that the Monegasque authorities should further increase their activity in this field. It indicated that, at the same time, the authorities should take care not to create unjustified reasons for differentiating between different groups of foreigners and should analyse the extent to which foreigners forced in practice to live outside Monaco could also benefit from such arrangements.[68]

4. Rights of specific persons or groups

Women[69]

39. CoE-GREVIO strongly encouraged Monaco to request opinions or studies from the High Commissioner, such as a study into pay differences or resources, with a view to acquiring a better grasp of the challenges that stand in the way of achieving full and effective gender equality; and support policies that foster genuine equality between women and men and study any proposals that would serve that purpose.[70]

40. CoE-GREVIO indicated that, following the enactment of Law No. 1.382 of 20 July 2011 on specific forms of violence, Monaco now had extensive legislation focusing on not only preventive and protective measures but also law enforcement measures and integrated policies relating to violence against women. This law was a step forward in many respects, in particular because it criminalised new forms of violence such as harassment, forced marriage and female genital mutilation, explicitly recognised marital rape, and enabled the domestic nature of the violence to be taken into account in determining sentences in individual cases.[71]

41. CoE-GREVIO considered, nonetheless, that the law had not been totally successful in addressing all the specific aspects of the situation of women victims of violence or in taking account of their particular vulnerability as distinct from that of children and persons with disabilities who were also covered by the law. In this regard, CoE-GREVIO stated that when applying the provisions of the Istanbul Convention to all victims of domestic violence, the authorities must pay particular attention to women victims and differentiate their situation.[72]

42. CoE-GREVIO also urged Monaco to: set up a body tasked with driving policies for preventing and combating violence against women, and drawing up a national action plan;[73] and step up support of NGOs involved in combating violence against women.[74]

43. CoE-GREVIO welcomed the fact that 2016 saw the launch by the authorities of a new single, anonymous and free telephone helpline, for victims of domestic violence noting that unfortunately, this number generally transferred to an answerphone and was therefore not accessible round the clock.[75] CoE-GREVIO urged the authorities to ensure a helpline service fulfilling all the criteria of the Istanbul Convention, including in terms of the hours covered.[76]

44. CoE-GREVIO stated that given that there were no forensic medical officers in Monaco, support for victims, including victims of sexual violence, should be stepped up by providing health care professionals with special training and/or by ensuring the competent services have greater access to expert forensic opinions.[77]

45. CoE-GREVIO encouraged the authorities to take further account of the greater difficulties that may be encountered by foreign women who do not master the language of the country, and to do so throughout the various stages of support. CoE-GREVIO encouraged the authorities to take the necessary steps to ensure language does not constitute a "de facto" ground of discrimination against foreign women who were victims of violence.[78]

46. CoE-GREVIO also encouraged the authorities to pay further attention to victims of violence who were financially dependent on the perpetrator and to the consequences of economic violence, in particular by helping these victims to regain their full autonomy.[79]

Children[80]

47. The Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children (GIEACPC) stated that corporal punishment of children in Monaco was lawful in the home and in alternative care and day care settings.[81]

48. GIEACPC indicated that during the previous cycle of the universal periodic review the issue of corporal punishment of children was raised in the compilation of United Nations information and the summary of stakeholders' information but nonetheless, no recommendations had been issued specifically on the issue.[82]

49. GIEACPC noted that the Government had repeatedly asserted that the criminal law on assault and battery, strengthened by amendments in 2007, adequately protected children from corporal punishment in all settings. However, there was no explicit prohibition of corporal punishment in the Penal Code or its amending laws.[83] The Committee on the Rights of the Child and the Committee Against Torture had both recommended that corporal punishment of children be prohibited in all settings.[84]

50. GIEACPC hoped that States would raise the issue during the review in 2018 and make a specific recommendation that Monaco draft and enact legislation as a matter of priority to clearly prohibit all corporal punishment of children in all settings, including in the home.[85]

51. The CoE-Commissioner stated that Monaco could strengthen protection of children's rights by banning all forms of corporal punishment of children as a clear demonstration that all forms of violence against children are unacceptable, and pointed out that some thirty Council of Europe member states had already introduced such a ban.[86]

Persons with disabilities[87]

52. The CoE-Commissioner welcomed the progress made in Monaco regarding the rights of people with disabilities, in particular the enactment in 2014 of a law giving persons with disabilities greater opportunities to obtain the support and assistance they need. The 2016 law on the accessibility of buildings was a further example of this progress.[88]

53. Regarding recommendations received in the previous cycle,[89] the Office of the High Commissioner for the protection of rights, liberties and for mediation noted with satisfaction the ratification, by the Principality of Monaco, of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities in 2017.[90] It pointed out, however, that Monaco had not yet set up an independent national mechanism to monitor the implementation of the Convention, as required under article 33 thereof.[91]

Migrants, refugees, asylum seekers and internally displaced persons[92]

54. Concerning asylum applications, the Office of the High Commissioner for the protection of rights, liberties and for mediation noted that the Monegasque authorities were able to consult the French Office for the Protection of Refugees and Stateless Persons when dealing with asylum applications submitted to them, pursuant to letters exchanged between the Principality of Monaco and the French Republic in June and July 1955. Such consultation was not systematic, however, and the opinions of the French Office, when sought, were not binding on the Principality. While noting that there were currently no legal provisions specifically governing the procedure for processing asylum applications, the Office of the High Commissioner expressed the view that the procedure ought to be incorporated into domestic law, which should specify, in particular, the reception measures to be adopted by the State in favour of asylum seekers while their cases were being assessed and the relevant criteria on which the State should base its decisions to accept or reject applications, taking into account applicable international agreements, in particular the Convention relating to the Status of Refugees of 28 July 1951.[93]

Notes

[1] The stakeholders listed below have contributed information for this summary; the full texts of all original submissions are available at: www.ohchr.org.

Civil society

Individual submissions:

GIEACPC	Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children, London (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland).
Haut Commissariat	Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertés et à la médiation, Monaco (Monaco).
ICAN	International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons , Geneva (Switzerland).

Regional intergovernmental organization(s):

CoE	The Council of Europe, Strasbourg (France). Attachments: (CoE-Grevio) Group of Experts on Action against Violence against Women and Domestic Violence. Baseline Evaluation Report, Monaco, Secretariat of the monitoring mechanism of the Council of Europe Convention on Preventing and Combating Violence against Women and Domestic Violence, Strasbourg, 2017; (CoE-GRECO) Group of States against Corruption, Fourth Round evaluation report, Corruption prevention in respect of members of parliament, judges and prosecutor of Monaco, adopted June 2017, published July 2017; (CoE-ECRI) European Commission against Racism and Intolerance, Report on Monaco, adopted on 8 December 2015, published March 2016.
OSCE-ODIHR	Office for Democratic Institutions and Human Rights of the Organisation for Security and Co-operation in Europe, Warsaw, Poland.

[2] The following abbreviations are used in UPR documents:

ICERD	International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination.
ICESCR	International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights.
OP-ICESCR	Optional Protocol to ICESCR.
ICCPR	International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights.
ICCPR-OP 1	Optional Protocol to ICCPR.
ICCPR-OP 2	Second Optional Protocol to ICCPR, aiming at the abolition of the death penalty.
CEDAW	Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women.
OP-CEDAW	Optional Protocol to CEDAW.
CAT	Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment.
OP-CAT	Optional Protocol to CAT.
CRC	Convention on the Rights of the Child.
OP-CRC-AC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the involvement of children in armed conflict.
OP-CRC-SC	Optional Protocol to CRC on the sale of children, child prostitution and child pornography.
OP-CRC-IC	Optional Protocol to CRC on a communications procedure.
ICRMW	International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families.
CRPD	Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities.
OP-CRPD	Optional Protocol to CRPD.
ICPPED	International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.

[3] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/25/12, paras. 89.1–89.9, 89.26, 90.1–90.19, 91.1–91.4.

[4] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/12/3 paras. 81.7 (Azerbaijan) (United Kingdom) (Czech Republic) et 81.11 (Czech Republic), and A/HRC/25/12, paras. 89.11 (Maldives), 89.40 (Costa Rica), 90.4 (Brazil) (France) and 90.5 (Estonia) (Togo).

[5] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertés et à la médiation de Monaco, p. 6.

[6] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/12/3 para. 81.2 (France) (Slovenia) and A/HRC/25/12, para. 89.37 (Nigeria).
[7] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertes et à la mediation de Monaco, p. 7.
[8] CoE-ECRI, para. 1.
[9] CoE-ECRI, paras. 2–3.
[10] CoE-ECRI, para. 4.
[11] ICAN, p. 1.
[12] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/25/12, paras. 89.10–89.22., 89.26–89.28, 89.40, 90.17, 91.5.
[13] CoE-GRECO, paras. 14 and 16.
[14] CoE-GRECO, para. 19.
[15] CoE-GRECO, para. 22.
[16] Council of Europe, p. 2.
[17] CoE-ECRI, para. 20.
[18] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertes et à la mediation de Monaco, p. 1.
[19] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertes et à la mediation de Monaco, p. 1.
[20] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertes et à la mediation de Monaco, p. 2.
[21] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertes et à la mediation de Monaco, p. 2.
[22] For the relevant recommendations, see A/HRC/25/12, paras. 89.23, 89.25, 89.29–89.36, 89.46, 91.7, 91.8 and 91.11.
[23] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/12/3 paras. 80.3 (Argentina), 80.4 (Brazil) and A/HRC/25/12, paras. 89. 29 (Ecuador), 89.30 (Tunisia), 89.31 (Cuba), 89.32 (Uruguay), 89.33 (Nigeria), 89.34 (Islamic Republic of Iran), 90.2 (France), 90.3 (Spain), 91.7 (Mexico).
[24] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertes et à la mediation de Monaco, pp. 2–3.
[25] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertes et à la mediation de Monaco, p. 3.
[26] Council of Europe, p. 2.
[27] CoE-ECRI, p. 9.
[28] CoE-ECRI, para. 13.
[29] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertes et à la mediation de Monaco, p. 4.
[30] CoE-ECRI, para. 19.
[31] CoE-ECRI, para. 22.
[32] CoE-ECRI, para. 24.
[33] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertes et à la mediation de Monaco, p. 3.
[34] Council of Europe, p. 3.
[35] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/12, paras. 89.11, 89.39–89.40.
[36] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertes et à la mediation de Monaco, p. 6.
[37] CoE-Grevio, paras. 6–7.
[38] CoE-ECRI, para. 37.
[39] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/12, paras. 89.28 89.39–89.40, 89.51 and 91.10.
[40] CoE-GRECO, para. 84.
[41] CoE-GRECO, para. 87.
[42] CoE-GRECO, para. 90.
[43] CoE-GRECO, para. 91.
[44] CoE-GRECO, para. 97.
[45] CoE-GRECO, para. 103.
[46] CoE-GRECO, para. 136.
[47] CoE-GRECO, para. 103.
[48] CoE-GRECO, para. 136.
[49] CoE-GRECO, para. 59.
[50] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/12, paras., paras. 89.12, 89.41, 91.6, 91.9.
[51] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/12/3 paras. 80.18 (Czech Republic) and A/HRC/25/12, paras. 89.12 (Canada).

[52] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertés et à la médiation de Monaco, p. 5.
[53] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertés et à la médiation de Monaco, p. 6.
[54] CoE-ECRI, paras. 52–53.
[55] ODIHR Submission of Information about an OSCE participating State or Partner for Co-operation under consideration in the Universal Periodic Review Process: Monaco, p. 1.
[56] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/12/3 para. 80.2. (Netherlands).
[57] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertés et a la médiation de Monaco, p. 5.
[58] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertés et à la médiation de Monaco, p. 5.
[59] Council of Europe, p. 3.
[60] CoE-ECRI, paras. 56–58.
[61] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/12, paras. 89.23, 89.45–89.46, 91.8.
[62] CoE-ECRI, para. 51.
[63] CoE-ECRI, para. 51.
[64] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/12/3 paras. 80.4 (Brazil) and 80.15 (Canada) and A/HRC/25/12, para. 89.46 (Republic of Moldova).
[65] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertés et à la médiation de Monaco, p. 4.
[66] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/12, para. 89.42.
[67] CoE-ECRI, paras. 42 and 54.
[68] CoE-ECRI, para. 54.
[69] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/12, paras. 89.23, 89.37 and 89.38.
[70] CoE-Grevio, para.12.
[71] CoE-Grevio, para. 3.
[72] CoE-Grevio, para. 4.
[73] CoE-Grevio, para. 22.
[74] CoE-Grevio, para. 32.
[75] CoE-Grevio, para. 82.
[76] CoE-Grevio, para. 85.
[77] CoE-Grevio, p. 6.
[78] CoE-Grevio, para. 15.
[79] CoE-Grevio, para. 18.
[80] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/12, paras 89.43, 89.49.
[81] GIE ACPC, para. 2.
[82] GIE ACPC, para. 1.1.
[83] GIE ACPC, para. 2.1.
[84] GIE ACPC, paras. 3.1–3.2.
[85] GIE ACPC, para. 1.3.
[86] Council of Europe, pp. 2–3.
[87] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/12, paras. 89.13 and 89.24.
[88] Council of Europe, p. 3.
[89] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/12, paras. 89.1 (France), 89.2 (Togo), 89.3 (Thailand), 89.4 (Morocco), 89.5 (Viet Nam), 89.6 (Spain), 89.7 (Albania) 89.8, (Indonesia), 89.9 (Tunisia).
[90] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertés et à la médiation de Monaco, p. 5.
[91] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertés et a la médiation de Monaco, p. 5.
[92] For relevant recommendations see A/HRC/25/12, para. 89.32, 89.45, 89.46, 91.9, 91.11.
[93] Contributions du Haut Commissariat à la protection des droits des libertés et à la médiation de Monaco, p. 6.